DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 274 56 RC 007 207

AUTHOR	Pryor, Guy C.
TITLE	Final Educational Accomplishment Audit of the Bilingual Education Program. Harlandale Independent School District, San Marcos Independent School District, Southwest Texas State University, 1971-72.
INSTITUTION	Harlandale Independent School District, San Antonio, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Bilingual Education.
REPORT NO	DPSC-97-0014
PUB DATE	29 Jul 72
NOTE	19p.; Related document is ED071795
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; *Comparative Analysis; Educational Improvement; *Evaluation Criteria; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Quality Control; *Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; ESEA Title VII; *Texas

ABSTRACT

The final audit report (1971-72) on the Bilingual Education Program of the Harlandale and San Marcos Independent School Districts gives a critique on the quality of the project evaluation, discusses the comparative findings of the project evaluation and the audit, and confirms or questions the need for program modifications proposed in the evaluation. The audit report is divided into 5 sections: (1) introductory and general comments on the quality of the project evaluation and the comparative findings of the project evaluation and the audit; (2) detailed critique of the product, process, and management evaluation for each compponent, based on an assessment of the instruments used, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques, and data analysis presentation; (3) description of the auditor's on-site findings and their correlation with the evaluator's data and reports on a component by component basis, summary of consistencies and discrepancies, and interpretation of discrepancies; (4) recommendations for evaluation design revisions with a rationale for each recommendation; and (5) confirmation or questioning of the need for program modifications proposed in the project evaluation. (Author/NQ)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
SEP 18 1973
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

ED 080274

FINAL EDUCATIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT AUDIT

OF THE

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Harlandale Independent School District

San Marcos Independent School District

Southwest Texas State University

1971-72

Submitted to:

Mr. Carlos G. Rodriguez
Project Director

and

The United States Office of Education as an educational accomplishment audit of the third year's operation of a program under the provisions of Title VII of P. L. 89-10, as amended.

By

Dr. Guy C. Pryor
Professor of Education
Our Lady of the Lake College

July 29, 1972

RC007207

EDUCATIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT AUDIT REPORT

Purpose of the Report

This Audit Report is made in compliance with the contractual agreements, legal prescriptions, and official directives under the Provisions of Title VII of Public Law 89-10, as amended, for the establishment and operation of bilingual education programs. This is an Audit Report on the Bilingual Education Program of the Harlandale Independent School District, San Marcos Independent School District, and the Southwest Texas State University, with Mr. Carlos G. Rodriguez as program director, in its third year of operation. The purpose of this report is to give a critique concerning the quality of the project evaluation and discuss the comparative findings of the project and the audit and to confirm or question the need for program modifications which have been proposed as a result of project evaluation.

Scope of the Report

The Audit Report follows rather closely the suggested Audit Report Content Areas received from the United States Office of Education and made a part of the contractual agreement between the auditor and the program director as follows:

1. Introductory and general comments concerning the adequacy and import of the project final evaluation.

2. Detailed critique of the product, process, and management evaluation conducted for each component, based on an assessment of the instruments used, data collection procedures, data analysis, and data analysis presentation.

3. Findings and observations as a result of on-site visits and examination of evaluative data with a summary of consistencies and discrepancies. Some of the changes and modification of the project and its evaluation.

4. Recommendations for revision of the evaluation design.

5. Confirmation or questioning of the need for program modifications which have been proposed as a result of project evaluation.

Each of the audit areas described above will be referred to as sections with the section numbers corresponding with the audit area description numbers.

SECTION I

Introductory and General Comments Concerning the Adequacy and Import of the Final Evaluation

The Evaluation Report for 1971-72 has followed the evaluation design with addenda. The evaluator has accomplished very well the desirable realistic purposes of a total bilingual program evaluation.

The Evaluation Report for 1971-72 is a document that is remarkable for its scientific objectivity, incisive analysis, logical and lucid interpretations, discerning appraisal, and sound educational recommendations. Project and administrative officials will do well to ponder carefully the evaluator's findings in their educational planning.

The evaluation report makes extensive use of the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of statistical data. This extensive use of statistical data is an appropriate technique for specific measurement of learning growth and levels of achievement. Many of the performance

objectives are evaluated by means of criterion-referenced quantitative measures. The person who makes only a superficial and cursory examination of the evaluation may arrive at a quick judgement that the statistical data are excessive. The persons more accustomed to reading statistical evidence will find this type of reporting meaningful.

Appropriately relevant questions may be raised about the extensive use of the type of pencil-and-paper tests that are being used to produce evaluative data. This is an area of national controversy ranging from efforts to abandon all formal testing for minorities to total endorsement of all testing with rigid interpretation. The evaluator of this project has used a wide variety of measures with many of them administered bilingually or written in both languages. The interpretative comments show modifications appropriate to the demographic diversity of the target pupil population. The variations in the extent of diversity in individual classrooms and in reasonable achievement expectations is recognized. Obviously the selection and use of tests need constant review in search of more valid means of appraisal. But the auditor is not one who advocates abandoning all formal testing. Even though the testing critics have many strong arguments on their side, the auditor views their extreme arguments as a rationalization for low achievement of minority pupils. The viewpoint of these extremists turns them into being apologists and ascribing the low achievements in language by minority pupils to an immutable condition which cannot be exposed by testing without injustice. The auditor views low achievement as the result of lack of learning opportunities. The constructive approach will seek the creation of a more productive learning environment. This

issue is brought in to this audit report because of the abundance of test data in the evaluation report and because of the national assessment crisis in bilingual education. The whirlwinds generated by the revelation of the results of many non-productive projects is turning into a political tornado. A more intelligent approach would be a reexamination of the superficial and partial bilingual programs whose negative results stem from the refusal to become immersed in a total bilingual approach that stresses full language development in the child's own native language system. A program that maximizes the opportunities for the children to learn perceptions and concepts in the natural processes of language development in their home language would have less to fear from the measurement system. The evaluator has made many constructive suggestions.

Extensive individual oral testing and more analytical techniques in data interpretation are commendable additions to the evaluation dimensions. The graphic presentations facilitate comparisons which suggest remediation aspects for the project. These are made specific by the evaluator.

The auditor must observe that improvements in evaluation techniques always add magnification to the visibility of instructional results. This clearer picture of various aspects of the project should not result in dissatisfaction with the evaluation but bring into focus program aspects in need of revision and remediation.

The three basic objectives of the bilingual project briefly stated are: (1) to prevent educational retardation of the Mexican-American child; (2) to obtain for the child the advantage of literacy

in two languages; (3) to give the Anglo child an opportunity to broaden his outlook by introducing him to a new language and a new culture. The third objective is a recent addition because of some changes in ethnicity in project pupils in certain classrooms. The extent to which these objectives are accepted and implemented within the school district and individual schools is one of the thrusts of the evaluation. The extent to which these objectives are realistic and operative needs to be constantly reexamined.

The frankness, the objectivity, and the comprehensiveness of the evaluation are its major aspects. The recommendations are educationally sound, timely, and clearly stated. These recommendations are more extensive and frank than those in previous reports.

One other comment on the general evaluation is pertinent at this point. The measurement of the effects of bilingual instruction on the learning of children was the one variable which was purported to be measured. However, since the pupils are instructed in the regular curriculum of the school as well as in the bilingual aspects of the program, the conclusion must inevitably be reached that the measured outcomes are more the outcomes of the regular school curriculum for Spanish-speaking children than they are the outcomes of the bilingual instructional program. This is food for thought.

The Program Description, beginning on Page 2 of the evaluation report, is rather accurate. The first part of this section identifies a total of eight goals and purposes for the bilingual program. It is against these stated desired outcomes that the entire program should

be evaluated. Comments at various points in the audit monitor the adequacy of the evaluation in covering these goals.

Table I, "Teachers, Schools, and Summary of Pupil Data," shows the extent of teacher exchange arrangement. The auditor has observed that some aspects of team teaching sometimes emerge in these arrangements. One of the more significant observations about these exchange plans is that one class is usually limited to the 40 to 60 minutes it spends with a bilingual teacher for experiences with the Spanish language and the Mexican-American cultures.

Table II, "San Marcos Ethnic Breakdown" uses a classification Spanish-Surname as the criterion for ethnic classification. It is also implied that this is one way to ascertain some of the learning needs of the pupils. In spite of the use of this term by the HEW as a civil rights and educational classification, it is observed in the Southwest that the term "Spanish-Surnamed" is becoming less and less valid as a device for ascertaining instructional needs of children.

The addition of a curriculum writer for the project has been commented on in previous reports. The auditor concurs with the evaluator in the statement that the curriculum writer has contributed immeasureably to the quality of the bilingual instructional program.

The fact that San Marcos and Harlandale school districts assumed project expenses for the first grade bilingual program when Title VII funds were no longer available is certainly believable evidence of the commitment of these two school districts to bilingual education.

Southwest Texas State University has greatly enhanced its bilingual teacher training and this has been brought in closer relationship with

other aspects of the bilingual project. It is easily observed that in addition to the pre-service training of bilingual teachers, this program has contributed efficiently to the testing and instructional aspects of the project.

SECTION II

Detailed Critique of the Project, Product, and Management Evaluation Conducted for Each Component, Based on Assessment of the Instruments Used, Data Collection Procedures, Data Analysis Techniques, and Data Analysis Presentation

Curriculum Development and Materials Acquisition and Adaptation Component

Again, the auditor concurs that the addition of the curriculum specialist is an invaluable addition to this component. Not only has she developed, produced, and modified curriculum materials, but she has also provided a more viable system for feedback from the teachers. The teachers are more pleased with their awareness that teachers are listened to and they do make an impact on the revision of instructional materials.

It has been observed quite readily that productive changes have been made toward a more functional use of linguistic phonemic, morphophonemic, and syntactic structures. The evaluator and curriculum specialist have both made contributions to this change. The linguistic techniques are used more as an analytical system for determining language patterns for the developmental language needs of children than as a language science to be taught directly to children. The auditor continues to think that

phonetic material should be replaced with materials produced in Spanish which meet the natural language development needs of low-income Mexican-American children.

Concerning the questionnaires evaluating the curriculum guides (p.12), the auditor has observed that replies to many of these questionnaires were constructive and useful but some of the replies were critical, negative, and non-productive. Some showed resentful attitudes. The evidence comes from an examination of the questionnaires and the comments of the curriculum specialist and the teachers. However, the channels of communication were kept open to all teachers.

It should be noted here that the curriculum materials stand as objective evidence that the persons in this component have been active and commendably fruitful in the production and revision of instructional materials. The new social studies units are outstanding examples.

Instructional Component

The figures and tables depicting growth and change in the project are accurate and impressive. It is significant that kindergarten and fifth grades have been added and the first grades changed to local support. The fact that the first grade pupils constitute 24% of the project makes this a significant contribution by the local districts.

The problem of how much time is spent in instruction in Spanish and in English continues to be vexatious. The principals have a tendency to report the time that is listed on the school schedule. The teachers tend to report what the project expectations are. The coordinators have done probably the most accurate reporting of time. There is some

reason to question the adequacy of the samples even here. The fact that in the exchange-teacher situations a Spanish-speaking teacher is present in one of the pair of classrooms only 40-60 minutes each day makes it difficult to understand how such a high percentage of time in Spanish could be used in so many areas in so brief a time. Surely the aides are not doing that much instruction in Spanish. The auditor has examined the records of time spent. He could not possibly obtain enough data from personal observation to contradict the records. His questions arise more from divergent reports and logic than from the limited observations.

The problem of the elusive so-called team-teaching is further complicated by the fact that pupils in the homeroom of the English-speaking teacher in many instances scored higher on the Metropolitan Achievement Test than the pupils in the homeroom of the Spanish-speaking teacher. The differences are not preponderant enough for one to draw conclusions but some of the data indicated trends that need further study. This problem merits special analysis in future evaluation studies.

The evaluator's analysis (p.14) of the lack of pupil continuity in bilingual instruction, over the years the project has operated, is most commendable and is clearly reported. Her reasons for accounting for the existence of the problem are well founded and the means for remediation have been identified. This was discussed with the elementary principals in a meeting which the auditor attended. The efforts to enlist the principals' support in reducing the dropouts and shifts from bilingual instruction appeared quite ineffective. The idea even emerged without successful contradiction that bilingual education was like special

education, something to be used until the pupils could work out of it. The impossible instructional situation created by adding new pupils at the upper grade levels was not effectively discussed other than by saying in effect that keeping the sections of each grade balanced superceded the instructional problems of bilingual education as an operational priority. The auditor agrees with the evaluator that this problem needs effective LEA administrative attention.

The evaluator suggests (p.21) decreased dependence on cuadernos. The auditor suggests complete elimination. The evaluator has highlighted the evidence produced by the data that there is a great need for more emphasis and increased effectiveness in the teaching of reading comprehension. The basic skills in language development are listening, speaking, and language experiences that result in concept development. The symbols of written language are less awesome to the child when meaning has been added. The evaluator's suggestions should be studied and implemented.

The success of the Harlandale Kindergarten program should be duly noted. The auditor has also observed that this was an effective use of Spanish as a first language for instruction in language development concepts. When the instruction has been bilingual, the testing should be bilingual even when the testing is directed by officials outside the project. The auditor observed a serious violation of this principle in the Harlandale Kindergarten.

The graphic presentations (beginning on p. 27) give a clear picture of variability and growth at three quartile levels and facilitate comparisons. This is a commendable procedure.

The test data on reading and achievement are clearly presented and analyzed. This requires no special comments.

The summative analysis and comments, (p.55), are accurate, logical, and clearly stated. The results of comparing test results for full-time and part-time pupils in the project through the years is most interesting. The implications for project direction and instructional modification are intriguing. This should be carefully studied and appropriate action taken. Next year's evaluation should study this further.

Appraisal-type statements are (p.58, par.4) made concerning the improvement in quantity and quality of the evaluation design over the three years and the improvement and expansion of the behavioral objectives and the efficacy of their evaluation. In all this the auditor concurs. However, the auditor questions the relevancy of some of the behavioral objectives and their adequacy in setting parameters of learning. The holistic and humanistic potential of bilingual and bicultural learning has not yet been freed of the closed-system-type restraints inherent in the present behavioral objectives.

All persons in the project including the auditor have experienced the displeasure of the teachers with locally-produced tests which measure the outcomes of the curriculum units. They continue to say it is too much testing. Their own indefinite type of subjective assessment seems to them to be adequate. The spirit of accountability should not so easily be cast aside.

McDaniel's Inferred Self-Concept Scale yielded more positive results this year in the self-concept improvement on a pre- and post-test basis. Whether this is an actual improvement of self-concept building or is an

increase in the teachers' skill in manipulating the reporting of observation of pupil behavior so as to show more positive change is impossible to tell. The judgements applied to behavioral observations can be quite subjective in applying this scale. The evaluator reports the change as most satisfactory.

Item 31.2, p. 67, states the following behavioral objective for five-year-old kindergarten pupils:

> "By the first week in March, 80% of the students will recite the Pledge of Allegiance in Spanish and English with 100% accuracy."

This is a travesty against childhood and a desecration of the beautiful Pledge of Allegiance. This is a resurrection of the discredited indoctrination efforts of having small children parrot meaningless phrases for the edification of misguided adults of the last century. It should have been left in the graveyard of archaic pedagogy.

Before leaving the Instructional Component, another look at Table XXV, Page 42, of the Evaluation Report, showing the extent to which the project objectives were attained by the fifth grade pupils in Harlandale, could be thought provoking. The figures indicate very low percentages, 0% to 14%, in attaining project objectives. Since the causal factors producing these conditions cannot be objectively identified, the evaluator has refrained from speculating. However, other data on pupil continuity available in the evaluation can certainly be associated with these indicators of lack of achievement. At the fifth grade level not more than 45% of the pupils had been in the bilingual instructional project for the entire three years of its operation. This means that 55% of the pupils had not experienced continuous instruction in the project.

This, coupled with a condition to which the teachers are frequently referring that a tendency exists to place in the bilingual classrooms the pupils with the greatest learning deficits, is an indication of causality. Lack of instructional continuity and grouping pupils of low achievement are effective recipes for academic low achievement.

The measurement of the achievement of behavioral objectives is meticulously done with massive testing and voluminous reporting. The abandonment of these procedures is not suggested, but their reduction seems imperative.

Staff Development Component

The program for in-service staff, as described by the evaluator, was greatly improved in design and content. Its assessment was more varied and specific. The quality of the program improved, and the auditor can attest to the fact that the teachers were more frank in their appraisal.

The auditor agrees that the "individualized self-training kits for the use of bilingual teachers, student interns and student teachers" was an innovative and promising idea. The kits could have been used more effectively and extensively. Apparently very few teachers finished a kit.

The efforts at effective rating of teachers ran afoul of the usual hazards of this activity. New procedures are contemplated for next year.

The evaluator's appraisal of the results of teacher-rating, p. 89, is confirmed by the auditor's findings from examining the rating results and talking with some of the principals. It is evident, however, that many dedicated bilingual teachers in the project are improving in

competencies and skills. The project suffers from the high attrition rate of teachers.

The auditor views the staff development component as being better planned, as using a wider variety of techniques, and as more effective in obtaining results.

The pre-service intern and teacher preparation program was a commendable and successful addition. The evaluator has adequately analyzed its problems, recognized its contributions, and appraised the achievements. It is significant that some of the problems the principals had in rating their teachers were also present in the teachers' ratings of their interns. The auditor was impressed by the performance of the interns in administering the tests, both pre- and post.

Community Involvement Component

The evaluator's appraisal of the community involvement aspects is consistent with facts. The auditor was impressed with the tremendous attendance of the parents at a project program in spite of the most inclement weather. The evaluator's suggestions are most appropriate. Better two-way communication at the "grass roots" level would be helpful.

Project Coordination Component

The personnel changes in project leaders were quite significant. The evaluator was the only leader from the 1970-71 staff who served the entire year of 1971-72 in the same position. The evaluator has listed all the changes. The transitions were planned and accomplished with a minimum of disruption. Mrs. Calonge and Mrs. Mora were both effective and strong leaders throughout the year. Mr. Rodriguez was most able in wearing his multiple hats. Dr. Hughes provided able assistance throughout the year. Cooperation with the auditor was excellent by all members of the staff and other project personnel.

Plans are being put into effect that indicate LEA administration is taking effective action for improvement of attitudes of administrative personnel that will encourage better project implementation and communication.

SECTION III

Findings and Observations as a Result of On-Site Visits and Examination of Evaluative Data with a Summary of Consistencies and Discrepancies

The activities engaged in by the auditor on on-site visits included:

1. Attendance at in-service meeting-discussed the relationship between evaluation and auditing.
2. Examined and approved all tests, rating forms and scales, and evaluation instruments.
3. Interviewed teachers and principals.
4. Observed both pre-test and post-test administration in both districts.
5. Interviewed teachers and testers in both districts.
6. Observed the test scoring and sampled most adequately the test results, opinionnaires, rating scales, all data and all data-processing techniques.
7. Numerous conferences with the project coordinators, the curriculum writer, and LEA curriculum directors.
8. Examined all curriculum and instructional materials produced by the project.
9. Attended National Bilingual Conference with project personnel.
10. Attended meetings of LEA administrators, project personnel, elementary principals and teachers concerning the implementation of project recommendations.

11. Met with President of Southwest Texas State University, Project Director, and LEA administrators concerning plans.

12. Attended meetings of the Bexar County Bilingual Association.

13. Visited several bilingual classrooms.

14. Checked time allotments in teaching and the observance of evaluation schedules and time line.

15. Checked project changes and revisions with the recommendations.

16. Went over the evaluation and audit reports with concerned project personnel.

The completeness of the discussions between the evaluator, the auditor, the director, coordinators, and the curriculum writer have made a minimum of discrepancies between the evaluation design and findings and the auditor's recommendations and double checking. The consistencies are maximized. Numerous specifics have been identified in Sections I and II of this report. These need not be repeated. The numerous appraisal statements of the evaluation and its findings in these sections are other aspects of these congruencies or discrepancies. These consistencies and discrepancies will be further reviewed, but the abundance of the data with careful analysis and objective interpretation have reduced the discrepancies to a small proportion. The major concerns are in reference to the recommendations of the evaluator on Page 104 of the report. These recommendations are, for the most part, based solidly on evaluation data.

The first recommendation concerning the cuadernos is strongly supported by the auditor. It is a waste of precious pupil time to have excessive phonetic emphasis injected into the Spanish language. Materials

written in Spanish to convey meaning would be far more productive.

The suggestions for obtaining more pupil continuity are well founded.

The suggestions for effective time allocation in team-teaching should be implemented. A comparative study of pupil achievement in these situations is strongly indicated by the data.

The recommendation - "Experiential, concept and vocabulary development should be stressed by all teachers but especially by those in kindergarten and first grade." - is strongly indicated by all evidence. A more effective use of oral language as the primary learning technique is a means for implementation. The evaluator states this pointedly in her next recommendation.

The auditor agrees with the recommendations so wholeheartedly that even to discuss them is to weaken them. The evaluator's recommendations are very clearly stated, completely valid, and should be implemented.

SECTION IV

Recommendations for Revision of the Evaluation Design

The auditor has no major suggestions for revision of the evaluation design except those reductions which are made necessary by the new directives from the United Stated Office of Education. The future evaluations will not be improved by these necessary reductions.

SECTION V

Confirmation or Questioning of the Need for Program Modifications Which Have Been Proposed as a Result of Projct Evaluation

The auditor has found no reason to question the recommendations for program revisions. His previous comments have been consistent on this point.

One additional recommendation seems appropriate. The performance objectives should be continuously restudied and revised toward the goal of making these performance objectives more reflective of the holistic, cognitive, and humanistic outcomes desired for a comprehensive program of bilingual, bicultural education.

The implementation aspects of the program should catch up with the revelations of the evaluation.

Summary of Recommendations and Comments

1. The Final Evaluation for 1971-72 is the most comprehensive and the most specific that has been done for this project.

2. The evaluation is accurate, and the data have been properly analyzed and interpreted.

3. The recommendations made by the evaluator stem from findings and are educationally sound and administratively feasible. They should be carefully studied by project management and LEA administrators and implemented.

4. Although there is objective evidence of the districts' commitment to bilingual education in a generalized way, it has never been made clear to concerned personnel that the administrators are fully committed to the project goals as stated in the continuation proposal, the evaluation design, and this evaluation report. Clarification of this total commitment in writing with oral reinforcement, without equivocation, would have a most affirmative effect on principals and teachers.

5. The process of integrating the bilingual instructional program with the regular school curriculum has not been fully accomplished. The need is still there. Some of the efforts made by the LEA administrators gave promise of change, but the follow-through was not fully carried out. A study of the evaluator's recommendation will reveal there is still much to be done.

6. The administrators of Harlandale and San Marcos school districts and of Southwest Texas State University are to be commended for having initiated and made provisions for a bilingual instruction program through these three years with expansion and improvements each year.

7. The auditor again expresses his gratitude to the administrators and to project management for the unstinting cooperation with him in the performance of his project duties.

8. The project has much merit and should be funded for the projected entire five-year period.